

North, Oliver
LIES

MEMORANDUM

TO: Geoff Stewart
FROM: Shane Smithton
DATE: July 20, 1989
RE: Project - Catalog of North's lies

As per your request, I have reviewed Oliver North's trial testimony. The information pertaining to North's false statements are separated by subject headings along with the applicable testimony and exhibits.

In addition, I have provided you with a previously compiled notebook entitled "North's False Statements."

The Judgment and Conviction that you requested is attached at Tab 7.

Should you require a more detailed analysis or clarification of any particular subject, please let me know.

Applicability of Boland

Context: Under direct questioning by Sullivan, North indicates that he believed that the Boland Amendment did not apply to the NSC:

BY SULLIVAN

Q: DID YOU TALK WITH MR. CASEY ABOUT APPLICABILITY OF THE BOLAND AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL?

A: I TALKED TO DIRECTOR CASEY. I TALKED TO MR. MCFARLANE. I TALKED TO THE NSC LAWYERS. THERE WERE LOTS OF PEOPLE WHO LOOKED AT THE APPLICABILITY OF BOLAND TO THE NSC AND NONE OF THEM, THOSE THAT I TALKED TO ABOUT THAT ASPECT OF IT, PARTICULARLY DIRECTOR CASEY WHO WAS THE ONE THAT ENCOURAGED ME AND BASICALLY WENT TO MR. MCFARLANE TO GET THIS WHOLE THING STARTED AS I UNDERSTOOD IT, NONE OF THEM THOUGHT THAT IT APPLIED TO THE NSC. (North Trans. at 6817)

Context: During cross-examination, North made a statement which contradicts that he believed Boland didn't apply to the NSC.

BY KEKER.

Q: COLONEL NORTH, WHY DIDN'T YOU USE NATIONAL

SECURITY COUNSEL FUNDS FOR YOUR OPERATIONAL FUNDS AS OPPOSED TO ASKING MR. CALERO AND MR. SECORD FOR MONEY FOR OPERATIONS?

A: BECAUSE THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNSEL DOESN'T MAINTAIN OPERATIONAL FUNDS FOR THOSE PURPOSES. IT'S NOT LIKE THE CIA WHICH HAS THOSE KINDS OF ACCOUNTS AND WE WERE TRYING VERY HARD TO COMPLY WITH THE PROSCRIPTION OF THE BOLAND AMENDMENT. THE BOLAND AMENDMENT SAID YOU COULDN'T USE APPROPRIATED MONIES FOR THOSE PURPOSES AND WE WERE TRYING TO ABIDE BY IT.

Q: I THOUGHT I HEARD YOU SAY DURING THE DIRECT EXAMINATION THAT IT WAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT THE BOLAND AMENDMENT DID NOT APPLY TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNSEL?

A: WE DID NOT BELIEVE THAT IT DID APPLY TO THE NSC AND BECAUSE THE BOLAND MEASURE WAS AN APPROPRIATIONS MEASURE, TALKING ABOUT MONEY, WE TRIED VERY HARD NOT TO IN ANY WAY VIOLATE THE LETTER OR THE SPIRIT OF THE BOLAND AMENDMENT AND THEREFORE EVEN THOUGH IT DIDN'T APPLY, IF WE HAD USED NSC MONIES FOR THOSE PURPOSES, EVEN IF THERE HAD BEEN SUCH AN ACCOUNT IT COULD HAVE BEEN SEEN AS A VIOLATION OF THAT AND SO WE SOUGHT TO AVOID ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT IT BY USING THE OPERATIONAL ACCOUNT FOR THOSE ACTIVITIES.

Q: OK. I DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT. ARE YOU SAYING THAT IF YOU USED NATIONAL SECURITY COUNSEL MONIES TO HELP THE CONTRAS, THE EFFORT THAT YOU SPENT THIS MONEY FOR, THE \$300,000, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN OR WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN A VIOLATION OF THE BOLAND AMENDMENT AS YOU UNDERSTOOD IT WHEN YOU WERE SPENDING THIS \$300,000?

A: IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THE BOLAND AMENDMENT DID NOT APPLY TO THE NSC PER SAY OR THE WHITE HOUSE PER SAY AND THAT IT ALSO PROSCRIBED THE USE OF MONIES APPROPRIATED FOR BY THE CONGRESS FOR THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND THEREFORE WE SOUGHT TO AVOID EITHER VIOLATION OF THE BOLAND AMENDMENT BY HAVING THE NSC CARRY OUT THESE ACTIVITIES IN USING NON US GOVERNMENT MONIES TO CARRY FORWARD THE OPERATION. FURTHERMORE, THE NSC DID NOT HAVE OPERATIONAL ACCOUNTS FOR THOSE KIND OF PURPOSES LIKE THE CIA DOES, FOR EXAMPLE, OR THE DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OR THE DEA FOR THAT MATTER. I'M JUST -- THE NSC IS NOT EQUIPPED TO HANDLE THAT KIND OF ACTIVITY.

Q: I WANT TO MAKE SURE I UNDERSTAND THIS. IS THE REASON THAT YOU DID NOT USE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNSEL FUNDS BECAUSE YOU THOUGHT IT WOULD VIOLATE THE BOLAND AMENDMENT OR BECAUSE YOU THOUGHT SOMEBODY MIGHT ACCUSE YOU OF VIOLATING THE BOLAND

AMENDMENT OR SOME OTHER REASON. I STILL DON'T UNDERSTAND IT.

A: NO. AS I TRIED TO EXPLAIN, I DID NOT BELIEVE APPLIED TO THE NSC ONE, NUMBER TWO, I DID NOT BELIEVE THAT WE WOULD USE APPROPRIATED MONIES TO CARRY OUT THESE ACTIVITIES. NUMBER THREE, WE DID NOT HAVE A FUND AS THE CIA DOES FOR THESE KIND OF ACTIVITIES SO ONE WAS ESTABLISHED FROM PRIVATE SOURCES. (North Trans. at 7171-7173)

Comment: I'm not sure he ever clears up the contradiction. It seems clear that if North felt that Boland did not apply to the NSC, he would not have been concerned that use of NSC monies could be a violation.

Fundraising

Context: In the following exchange, Keker questions North about his specific activities as they relate to fundraising.

BY KEKER

Q: WHEN YOU GOT PERMISSION FROM THESE TWO GENTLEMEN (Don Fortier and Robert McFarlane) TO DO FUNDRAISING, WHAT WERE YOU TOLD? GIVE US THE WHOLE CONVERSATION. WHAT DID YOU SAY TO THEM AND WHAT DID THEY SAY TO YOU ABOUT FUNDRAISING FOR THE CONTRAS?

A: THE ONLY -- THE ONLY GUIDANCE THAT I GOT SPECIFICALLY ABOUT FUNDRAISING, IN DEALING WITH PRIVATE CONTRIBUTORS AS ONE OF THE CATEGORIES OF SOURCES OF MONEY FOR THE RESISTANCE, WAS THAT I COULD NOT AND SHOULD NOT AND WOULD NOT DIRECTLY SOLICIT. I COULD NOT TAKE AND COULD ASK NO PERSON DIRECTLY WOULD YOU GIVE MONEY TO DO THIS. AND I NEVER DID THAT. (North Trans. at 7217)

Q: . . . AT IBC, MR. MILLER WOULD TAKE OUT 10 PERCENT?

A: I DON'T KNOW WHETHER HE TOOK IT OUT THERE IN I.C., INC.

Q: BUT HE WOULD THEN MOVE THE MONEY OFFSHORE?

A: YES.

Q: AWAY FROM THE UNITED STATES?

A: YES.

Q: AND THERE --

A: WHICH IS NOT ATYPICAL FOR A COVERT OPERATION,
THAT'S WHAT THE CIA DOES.

Q: HE WOULD HOLD THE MONEY HERE AND YOU WOULD TELL
HIM HOW TO SPEND IT, WHO TO GIVE IT TO?

A: I WOULD TELL HIM WHAT VARIOUS NEEDS WERE AND HE
WOULD MAKE THE DISTRIBUTIONS.

Q: DID YOU CALL MR. MILLER AND SAY, CAN YOU COME UP
WITH \$30,000?

A: I THINK I HAD ASKED MR. MILLER FOR THAT SPECIFIC
AMOUNT. I DO RECALL THAT PARTICULAR CONVERSATION.
(North Trans. at 7257)

Q: WHAT WAS THE INSTRUCTION YOU GOT ABOUT NOT
ASKING PEOPLE FOR MONEY?

A: THAT I COULD NOT GO OUT AND SOLICIT, ASK PRIVATE
AMERICAN CITIZENS FOR MONEY.

Q: WAS RICHARD MILLER A PRIVATE AMERICAN CITIZEN?

A: YES BUT HE WAS ACTIVELY ENGAGING IN THE PROCESS
OF TRYING TO GET MONEY TO THE RESISTANCE.

Q: SO WAS EVERYBODY ELSE THAT CONTRIBUTED, WEREN'T
THEY?

A: I AM NOT TRYING TO DENY THE FACT THAT I TALKED
NUMEROUS TIMES TO MR. MILLER ABOUT PUTTING MONEY IN
VARIOUS PLACES AND I JUST DESCRIBED A BUNCH OF THEM
TO YOU ON THIS CHART, I MEAN PROBABLY TO THE TUNE
OF HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS. (North Trans.

at 7257-7258)

Comment: North admits in this sequence that he was specifically instructed not to request money from private citizens. He admits he did ask for money from Miller and recognizes Miller as a private citizen. His justification throughout this line of questioning is that he did not ask for the money from the donor directly. He seems to justify his activities merely because the money flows through the hands of a third party, Miller. He is likely to say that his superiors meant for him to continue in that manner, but it would seem that a good marine would follow his instructions not to solicit private citizens, explicitly.

Alteration of Documents

Context: The following dialogue pertaining to questioning about documents which McFarlane wanted North to alter.

BY SULLIVAN

Q: TELL THE JURY WHAT HAPPENED IN THAT MEETING WITH MCFARLANE WITH REGARD TO THESE DOCUMENTS?

A: MR. MCFARLANE SHOWED ME THE PILE OF DOCUMENTS AND SAID, THERE ARE SEVERAL IN HERE THAT ARE - MY RECOLLECTION OF THE WORD IS PROBLEMATIC, THAT THIS HANDFUL, AND HE PULLED OUT SEVERAL, ARE A PROBLEM AND THEY ARE INCONSISTENT WITH WHAT WE HAD SAID TO THE CONGRESS.

AND HE SAID, THESE NEED TO BE FIXED. IN FACT, HE HANDED ME A LIST THAT HAD THESE DOCUMENTS ON IT AND, AS I RECALL, ALSO CITED SEVERAL OTHERS THAT I WROTE DOWN ON THE BACK OF THE LIST. HE GAVE ME THAT LIST, AND SAID FIX THESE DOCUMENTS SO THAT THEY ARE CONSISTENT WITH WHAT WE HAVE BASICALLY TOLD THE CONGRESS.

Q: WHAT DID YOU RESPOND TO HIM?

A: I GUESS MY -- I AM A LITTLE UNCERTAIN ABOUT WHAT MY ACTUAL RESPONSE WAS. BUT I KNOW AT ONE POINT I SAID SOMETHING TO THE EFFECT THAT THIS DOES NOT MAKE ANY SENSE. IT IS NOT JUST THESE DOCUMENTS,

NO OBJECTION
NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

THESE FIVE OR SIX OR SEVEN THAT HE HAD WRITTEN DOWN. THERE MUST BE THIRTY DOCUMENTS IN THE FILES THAT ARE FULL OF THAT KIND OF INFORMATION.

HE SAID, WELL, THEY WEREN'T ASSEMBLED. THEY ARE NOT IN THIS STACK, AND FROM NOW ON DON'T SEND ME ANY MORE OF THIS KIND OF STUFF IN THE SYSTEM. AND STOP SENDING ME PROFS ON THIS.

AND I SAID, "AYE-AYE," SIR, WHICH IS WHAT A MARINE SAYS. AND I TOOK THE LIST AND I WENT BACK TO MY OFFICE AND KNOWING THAT THERE WERE MANY MORE DOCUMENTS THAT REFLECTED ALL OF THIS. I TOOK THE LIST AND, IF I REMEMBER RIGHT, I TAPED IT TO THE SIDE OF THE COMPUTER IN MY OFFICE.

Q: WHAT HAPPENED TO THE REQUEST THAT HE MADE TO CHANGE DOCUMENTS? DID IT JUST SIT THERE?

A: BASICALLY IT DID BECAUSE I KNEW THAT THERE WERE SO MANY MORE OTHER DOCUMENTS THAT EXISTED THAT SHOWED THE FULL PATTERN OF THE ACTIVITY HE HAD AUTHORIZED AND SENT ME ON AND TOLD ME TO DO THAT IT WAS -- IT JUST SIMPLY DIDN'T MAKE ANY SENSE TO CHANGE THESE FIVE OR SIX DOCUMENTS. IN FACT, IF I REMEMBER CORRECTLY HE ACTUALLY SAID HERE'S HOW I AM CHANGING ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS AND I JOTTED IT DOWN ON THE BACK OF THE LIST.

Q: SO WHY DIDN'T YOU DO WHAT HE SAID?

A: BECAUSE IT JUST DIDN'T -- I DIDN'T THINK IT MADE

ANY SENSE. (North Trans. at 6903-6906)

Comment: North has projected himself as a good marine who just took orders and carried them out. This is an example where he seems to "blow off" an order that he doesn't think is particularly important. It is inconsistent with the image he tries to project of himself. He says "Aye-Aye" which is what a marine says, but does a marine let an order "just sit there."

Hamilton Letter

Context: Keker asks North about the letter that he and McFarlane were working on to respond to a letter by Congressman Hamilton which raises some concern about NSC activities.

Q: OKAY. HE GOES ON TO SAY "I CAN" -- EXCUSE ME, YOU (North) GO ON TO SAY, THIS IS YOU TAKING A STAB AT IT (at writing the letter), "I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT THE ACTIONS OF MY STAFF HAVE BEEN FULLY CONSISTENT WITH BOTH THE SPIRIT AND THE LETTER OF THE LAW." NOW, WHERE DID THAT LANGUAGE COME FROM?

A: I WOULD GUESS OUT OF MY TYPEWRITER.

Q: OKAY. ANYWAY DID YOU -- IT WAS FALSE WASN'T IT?

A: NO.

Q: YOUR ACTIONS UP TO THAT POINT HAD BEEN, IN YOUR VIEW, CONSISTENT WITH THE SPIRIT OF THE BOLAND AMENDMENT?

A: YES. THE BOLAND AMENDMENT DID NOT ALLOW THE CIA OR THE DOD TO EXPEND FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING DIRECT OR INDIRECT SUPPORT FOR MILITARY OR PARA-MILITARY ACTIVITIES. FURTHERMORE, IT DID NOT APPLY TO THE NSC. FURTHERMORE, THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND MR. MCFARLANE AND BY NOW DIRECTOR CASEY HAVE ME RUNNING ALL OVER THE PLACE I ASSUMED CONSISTENT WITH THE SPIRIT AND LETTER OF

BOLAND, TRYING NOT TO VIOLATE BOLAND BY GOING OUTSIDE THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO SUPPORT THE RESISTANCE BY NOT EXPENDING FUNDS APPROPRIATED BY THAT ACT FOR THAT PURPOSE. (North Trans. at 7367)

Comment: This is another case where he justifies his activities at the NSC by saying that Boland didn't apply. Again, this is contradictory because he has already expressed that he felt using NSC funds might be seen as a violation of Boland.

Context: Keker now asks North about some of the specific language that North's first draft of the letter to Hamilton contained.

Q: OKAY. LET'S GO ON AND LOOK AT SOME OF THE LANGUAGE BECAUSE SOME OF IT WILL BECOME IMPORTANT LATER. "DISCUSSIONS WITH THE RESISTANCE LEADERSHIP HAVE FOCUSED ON THE CHANGING POLITICAL SITUATION IN WASHINGTON AS WE MOVED FROM COVERT SUPPORT FOR THEIR CAUSE IN 1983 TO THE CONSTRAINTS IMPOSED BY THE BOLAND RESTRICTIONS IN 1984 AND 1985 TO THE CURRENT SITUATION IN WHICH WE WERE ABLE TO PROVIDE OVERT HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE. WE HAVE ALSO CONVEYED TO THE RESISTANCE LEADERSHIP OUR CONCERNS

ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS, IN DOING SO HAVE URGED THEM TO THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATE ALLEGATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES AND TO TAKE ACTION TO PREVENT THEM. FURTHER DISCUSSIONS HAVE FOCUSED ON OUR CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR A DEMOCRATIC OUTCOME AND OUR COMMITMENT TO SUPPORT THEIR PROPOSAL FOR A CHURCH-MEDIATED DIALOGUE WITH THE SANDINISTAS LEADING TO AN ETERNAL RECONCILIATION. WE DID NOT INTERPRET THE BOLAND RESTRICTIONS AS PROHIBITING CONTACT WITH THE RESISTANCE FOR THESE PURPOSES." IN THAT PARAGRAPH YOU WERE TRYING TO AVOID TELLING THE CONGRESS ABOUT WHAT YOU HAD BEEN DOING TO HELP THE MILITARY OPERATIONS OF THE CONTRAS?

A: VERY CLEARLY.

Q: OKAY. SO THAT IT WAS ON YOUR MIND THAT WHAT YOU WOULD DO IS WRITE A LETTER THAT WOULD NOT COMMUNICATE WHAT YOU HAD BEEN DOING TO HELP THE MILITARY PURPOSES OF THE CONTRAS?

A: I VERY CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD THAT THAT'S WHAT I WAS TO DO AND THAT'S WHAT I TRIED TO DO.

Q: OKAY. THEN THE NEXT SENTENCE SAYS "RECENT CONTACTS WITH THE RESISTANCE HAVE DEALT WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE \$27,000,000 IN HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE." IN FACT, THAT'S ONE OF THE THINGS THAT RECENT CONTACTS HAD DEALT WITH BUT IT HAD ALSO DEALT WITH THE SOUTHERN FRONT AND THE AIR FORCE FOR

THE SOUTHERN FRONT AND RAISING MONEY FROM TAIWAN
AND SO ON, RIGHT?

A: YES.

Q: AND YOU LEFT THAT PART OUT?

A: YES.

Q: WHY?

A: BECAUSE IT WOULD HAVE REVEALED THE ESSENCE OF AL
THAT HAD TRANSPIRED SINCE MR. MCFARLANE AND THE
PRESIDENT GOT THE \$32 MILLION FROM SAUDI ARABIA.

Comment: This language was in North's original draft of the letter to Hamilton, he can't attribute it to his superiors. He had already said that his original attempt was not guided except to say, take a "stab" at answering the letter. His own answers are not outright lies, but he does admit the letter was an attempt to avoid being completely honest with Congress. His justification will likely be that he was told to maintain secrecy to preserve the safety of the hostages and the reputation of the administration.

Context: Keker is now asking North about language McFarlane added when he edited North's draft of the letter, and what North was to do next.

Q: MR. MCFARLANE ADDS SOME LANGUAGE THAT IS EVEN
STRONGER THAN ANYTHING YOU HAD SAID IN YOUR LETTER.

"IT IS EQUALLY IMPORTANT TO STRESS WHAT WE DID NOT DO. WE DID NOT SOLICIT FUNDS OR OTHER SUPPORT FOR MILITARY OR PARA-MILITARY ACTIVITIES EITHER FROM AMERICANS OR THIRD PARTIES. WE DID NOT OFFER TACTICAL ADVICE FOR THE CONDUCT OF THEIR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OR THEIR ORGANIZATION."

NOW, THAT PARTICULAR -- THOSE TWO SENTENCES ARE FLAT OUT FALSE, RIGHT?

A: THEY ARE FLAT OUT FALSE IN THAT I HAD, INDEED, OFFERED MILITARY ADVICE, AND I AM NOT GOING TO QUIBBLE OVER THE DEFINITION OF THE WORD "TACTICAL." WE CERTAINLY HAD SOLICITED FUNDS BY THE FACT THAT THE PRESIDENT AND MR. MCFARLANE BOTH HAD BEEN INVOLVED IN THOSE ACTIVITIES, AND THAT IT WAS FOR MILITARY AND PARA-MILITARY OPERATIONS OF THE RESISTANCE, BOTH FROM AMERICANS AND FROM PRIVATE CITIZENS. (North Trans. at 7386-7387)

Q: . . . NOW HE HAS EDITED YOUR LETTER AND HE WANTS YOU TO EDIT HIS LETTER. RIGHT?

A: THAT'S WHAT HE SAYS . . . (North Trans. at 7388)

Q: I WANT TO GET YOUR REACTION TO THE LETTER AS IT IS NOT DRAFTED BY MR. MCFARLANE HAVING WORKED OVER YOUR DRAFT. YOU RECOGNIZED THAT IT WAS --

A: FALSE.

Q: THOROUGHLY DECEPTIVE AND FALSE, DIDN'T YOU?

A: YES, I DID. (North Trans. at 7389)

Q: OKAY. NOW WHAT IS NOT ON THIS LIST OF TALKING POINTS (referring to notes North made on this draft when asked to edit it) IS ANY NOTE THAT SAYS ANYTHING ABOUT FUNDRAISING, IS IT?

A: NO.

Q: DID YOU WANT TO TALK TO HIM ABOUT FUNDRAISING? HOW COULD YOU WRITE THIS THING THAT SAYS NO FUNDRAISING IF WE HAD BEEN FUNDRAISING AND YOU KNEW ALL ABOUT IT?

A: I DON'T RECALL WHY I DIDN'T JOT DOWN FUNDRAISING. SURELY, HE KNEW THAT HE AND THE PRESIDENT HAD DONE IT. HE KNEW HE HAD AUTHORIZED ME TO GO TO THE TAIWANESE. HE KNEW THAT HE HAD AUTHORIZED ME TO SIT DOWN AND TALK WITH PEOPLE, LIKE I HAD BEEN DOING WITH MR. CHANNEL'S ORGANIZATION. (North Trans. at 7391)

Q: . . . WHEN YOU GOT MR. MCFARLANE'S DRAFT, IN ANY EVENT, YOU REALIZED THAT WHATEVER DECISION YOU HAD MADE ABOUT YOUR DRAFT, MR. MCFARLANE'S DRAFT WAS EVEN WORSE IN TERMS OF BEING DECEPTIVE AND OUTRIGHT FALSE?

A: I REALIZED IT WAS, YES.

Q: AND DID YOU THINK ABOUT MAYBE TRYING TO TALK HIM OUT OF DOING THAT?

A: AS I TESTIFIED EARLIER MY RECOLLECTION IS I MADE ONE LAST EFFORT TO SEE IF WE COULD GO BACK TO THE

ORIGINAL PROPOSAL OF NOT ANSWERING AT ALL, TO EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE. HE TOLD ME TO GO AHEAD AND GIVE ME HIS EDITS. I THINK I MADE SOME EDITS WHICH WERE FLUFF, HAPPY TO, GLAD-TYPE CHANGES AND THE LETTER WENT OUT. (North Trans. at 7399)

A: MR. KEKER, I HAVE ALREADY ADMITTED THAT MUCH OF WHAT MR. MCFARLANE WROTE IN THIS LETTER IS FALSE. MY EFFORTS IN THE EDITS THAT I AM MAKING ARE MINOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE CHANGES. THERE IS MUCH IN THIS LETTER THAT IS WRONG. SOME OF IT IS TRUE. I MADE AN EFFORT NOT TO HAVE THIS LETTER GO OUT. I LOST.

Q: OKAY. ANY QUALMS -- I MEAN, HE IS ASKING YOU AT THIS POINT TO ASSOCIATE YOURSELF -- YOU DO THE FIRST DRAFT. YOU DO THE LAST DRAFT -- ASSOCIATE YOURSELF FAIRLY CLOSELY WITH THE LETTER THAT HE IS SENDING TO CONGRESS THAT'S ABOUT YOUR ACTIVITIES. ANY QUALMS BESIDES POLITICAL ONES BY THIS TIME?

A: I WILL GO BACK TO WHAT I SAID EARLIER. MY WHOLE IMPETUS, MY WHOLE EFFORT, EVERYTHING THAT I DID IN THIS PROCESS UP TO THIS POINT, WAS AN EFFORT NOT TO HAVE THIS WHOLE PROCESS LAID BEFORE THE CONGRESS. I TRIED.

Q: PUT ASIDE THE POLITICS OF IT. ANY MORAL QUALMS, ANYTHING TELL YOU FROM YOUR UPBRINGING, YOUR NAVAL ACADEMY TRAINING, YOUR TIME IN THE MARINE CORPS, GEE, THIS DOESN'T SEEM RIGHT; THIS SEEMS WRONG TO

ME?

A: SURE. ABSOLUTELY.

Q: NOT JUST POLITICALLY. I MEAN MORALLY.

A: MORALLY.

Q: I AM NOT PROUD OF THIS?

A: I AM NOT PROUD OF THIS. I AM NOT PROUD OF THE FACT THAT HE FELT THAT HE WAS IN THAT POSITION. I AM NOT PROUD OF THE FACT THAT THE ADMINISTRATION DIDN'T STAND UP AND DO WHAT I THOUGHT WAS RIGHT POLITICALLY. THE FACT IS, I DIDN'T THINK IT WAS UNLAWFUL. I DIDN'T THINK IT WAS RIGHT, BUT I DID NOT THINK IT WAS AGAINST THE LAW.

Q: BUT YOU KNEW IT WAS WRONG?

A: I HAVE JUST ADMITTED. I DIDN'T THINK IT WAS RIGHT. THEREFORE, IT MUST BE WRONG. (North Trans. at 7430-7431)

Comment: These excerpts were included because they indicate that North clearly knew that the letter that he had worked on was false and misleading. Keker asks North about some "talking points" that are written on one of the drafts to highlight what North had not brought up. There were no talking points indicating that North wanted to change or edit any of the falsehoods. He admits knowing that his behavior was wrong.

Attached are copies of the drafts, including final drafts of the letter from McFarlane to Hamilton. Tab 1 is Oliver North's original draft of the Hamilton letter. Tab 2 are two PROF notes from McFarlane. Tab 3 is McFarlane's verison of the Hamilton letter from the PROFs notes. Tab 4 is McFarlane's drafted version with North's annotations. Tab 5 is the final draft.